# GOVERNMENT OF INDIA
# COAL
# LOK SABHA

UNSTARRED QUESTION NO:3054
ANSWERED ON:11.03.2003
CLOSURE OF PROJECTS
V. VETRISELVAN

**Will the Minister of COAL be pleased to state:**

(a) whether a number of projects have been closed down mid- way by various subsidiaries of Coal India Limited;

(b) if so, the details thereof of and the reasons for closing down those projects, subsidiary-wise;

(c) the estimated loss suffered by Coal India Limited as a result thereof;

(d) whether the Union Government or any financial institution have come forward to restart those projects; and

(e) if so, the details thereof and the amount of assistance provided to CIL for this purpose?

## Answer

MINISTER OF COAL (SHRI KARIYA MUNDA)

(a) & (b): Yes, Sir. Details of projects (costing Rupees 20 crores and above) which have been closed down mid- way along with the reasons therefor are given below :-

| Sl No | Name of projects | Date of sanction | Sanctioned capital (Rs. crs.) | Ultimate capacity (Mty) | Reasons for closing down the projects |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Eastern Coalfields Limited | | | | |
| 1. | Bakulia UG | Aug 92 | 104.66 | 0.96 | 1. On recommendation of Group of Ministers which was constituted in February,94 to suggest specific measures to cut delays in implementation of projects<br>2. Fund constraint |
| 2. | Chinakuri 1 & 2 UG | Mar 85 | 45.54 | 0.69 | 1. On recommendation of Group of Ministers which was constituted in February,94 to suggest specific measures to cut delays in implementation of projects<br>2. Fund constraint |
| 3. | Laudoha UG | Mar 88 | 49.34 | 0.68 | Adverse geo-mining conditions |
| | South Eastern Coalfields Limited | | | | |
| 4. | Kapildhara UG AUG. | Mar 98 | 47.31 | 0.51 | This was a Mass Production Technology project. The bidder to whom the LOI was offered has expressed his inability to finalise the Agreement. Therefore, it is a non-starter. |
| 5. | Churcha | Dec | 48.61 | 0.65 | Contract between SECL |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| West (PSLW) | 94 | | | | and CME, China was signed for introducing PLW Technology but it could not be implemented because Hard Roof Management Technology for this Project could not be finalized. It is still frozen and as soon as technology is decided, decision for starting the project will be taken. |
| Bharat Coking Coal Limited | | | | | |
| 6. Vishwakarma OCP | Sep 97 | - | 44.74 | 0.70 | Land and rehabilitation problem. Project has been put in the frozen list till the problem is sorted out. |
| 7. Block III (Coking) OCP | Aug 91 | - | 45.97 | 0.45 | Fire problem. Project has been put in the frozen list till the problem is sorted out. |
| 8. Damodar OCP | Mar 84 | - | 57.04 | 1.00 | Fire problem. |
| Central Coalfields Limited | | | | | |
| 9. Hindegir OC | Mar 91 | - | 41.48 | 0.78 | Problem in acquisition of forest and non-forest land. |
| 10 Jaridih OC | Apr 93 | - | 48.83 | 0.60 | Adverse geo-mining conditions and land & rehabilitation problem. |
| 11 Karma OC | Dec 90 | - | 47.71 | 0.80 | Problem in acquisition of forest land and rehabilitation land. |
| 12 Parej East UG | Sep 92 | - | 28.42 | 0.30 | Land acquisition problem |
| 13 Termi OC | May 91 | - | 29.55 | 0.50 | Problem in acquisition of forest and non-forest land. |

(c):- The total estimated expenditure for the above projects is Rs.89.29 crores and the same has been incurred for procurement of various P&M items, HEMM, development of infrastructure etc. which are being gainfully utilised by the existing mines and shall continue to be used for some future / new projects also. Thus, the expenditure incurred cannot be accounted as a loss.

(d):- No, Sir.

(e): Does not arise in view of reply to (d) above.